arXiv:1702.07914v3 [cs.DM] 27 Apr 2017

On Chordal-k-Generalized Split Graphs

Andreas Brandstädt
Institut für Informatik, Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany
andreas.brandstaedt@uni-rostock.de

Raffaele Mosca
Dipartimento di Economia, Universitá degli Studi "G. D'Annunzio", Pescara 65121, Italy
r.mosca@unich.it

Abstract

A graph G is a *chordal-k-generalized split graph* if G is chordal and there is a clique Q in G such that every connected component in $G[V \setminus Q]$ has at most k vertices. Thus, chordal-1-generalized split graphs are exactly the split graphs.

We characterize chordal-k-generalized split graphs by forbidden induced subgraphs. Moreover, we characterize a very special case of chordal-2-generalized split graphs for which the Efficient Domination problem is $\mathbb{NP}$-complete.

Keywords: Chordal graphs; split graphs; partitions into a clique and connected components of bounded size; forbidden induced subgraphs; $\mathbb{NP}$-completeness; polynomial time recognition.

1 Introduction

$G = (V, E)$ is a *split graph* if V can be partitioned into a clique and an independent set. The famous class of split graphs was characterized by Főldes and Hammer in [5] as the class of $2K_2$-free chordal graphs, i.e., the class of $(2K_2, C_4, C_5)$-free graphs, and G is a split graph if and only if G and its complement graph $\overline{G}$ are chordal.

There are various important kinds of generalizations of split graphs: G is *unipolar* if there is a clique Q in G such that $G[V \setminus Q]$ is the disjoint union of cliques of G, i.e., $G[V \setminus Q]$ is P_3-free. Clearly, not every unipolar graph is chordal. G is called a *generalized split graph* [8] if either G or $\overline{G}$ is unipolar. Generalized split graphs are perfect, and Prömel and Steger [8] showed that almost all perfect graphs are generalized split graphs.

We consider a different kind of generalizing split graphs: A graph G is a *chordal-k-generalized split graph* if G is chordal and there is a clique Q in G such that every connected component in $G[V \setminus Q]$ has at most k vertices; we call such a clique Q a *k-good clique of G*. Thus, chordal-1-generalized split graphs are exactly the split graphs. We characterize chordal-k-generalized split graphs by forbidden induced subgraphs.

An *induced matching* $M \subseteq E$ is a set of edges whose pairwise distance in G is at least two. A *hereditary induced matching* (*h.i.m.*) is the induced subgraph of an induced matching, i.e., every connected component has at most two vertices, i.e., it is the disjoint union of an independent vertex set S and the vertex set of an induced matching M in G.

Thus, G is a chordal-2-generalized split graph if and only if G has a clique Q such that $G[V \setminus Q]$ is a hereditary induced matching.

2 Basic Notions and Results

For a vertex $v \in V$, $N(v) = \{u \in V : uv \in E\}$ denotes its (*open*) *neighborhood*, and $N[v] = \{v\} \cup N(v)$ denotes its *closed neighborhood*. A vertex v *sees* the vertices in $N(v)$ and *misses* all the others. The *non-neighborhood* of a vertex v is $\overline{N}(v) := V \setminus N[v]$. For $U \subseteq V$, $N(U) := \bigcup_{u \in U} N(u) \setminus U$ and $\overline{N}(U) := V \setminus (U \cup N(U))$.

For a set $\mathcal{F}$ of graphs, a graph G is called *$\mathcal{F}$-free* if G contains no induced subgraph isomorphic to a member of $\mathcal{F}$. In particular, we say that G is *H-free* if G is $\{H\}$-free. Let $H_1 + H_2$ denote the disjoint union of graphs H_1 and H_2, and for $k \geq 2$, let kH denote the disjoint union of k copies of H. For $i \geq 1$, let P_i denote the chordless path with i vertices, and let K_i denote the complete graph with i vertices (clearly, $P_2 = K_2$). For $i \geq 4$, let C_i denote the chordless cycle with i vertices. A graph G is *chordal* if it is C_i-free for any $i \geq 4$.



Figure 1: $2P_3$, $K_3 + P_3$, $2K_3$, butterfly, extended butterfly, extended co-P, extended chair, and double-gem

H is a *butterfly* (see Figure 1) if H has five vertices, say $v_1, \ldots, v_5$ such that v_1, v_2, v_3 induce a K_3 and v_3, v_4, v_5 induce a K_3, and there is no other edge in H. H is an *extended butterfly* (see Figure 1) if H has six vertices, say $v_1, \ldots, v_6$ such that v_1, v_2, v_3 induce a K_3 and v_4, v_5, v_6 induce a K_3, and the only other edge in H is v_3v_4.

H is an *extended co-P* (see Figure 1) if H has six vertices, say $v_1, \ldots, v_6$ such that $v_1, \ldots, v_5$ induce a P_5 and v_6 is only adjacent to v_1 and v_2.

H is a *chair* if H has five vertices, say $v_1, \ldots, v_5$ such that $v_1, \ldots, v_4$ induce a P_4 and v_5 is only adjacent to v_3. H is an *extended chair* (see Figure 1) if H has six vertices, say $v_1, \ldots, v_6$ such that $v_1, \ldots, v_5$ induce a chair as above and v_6 is only adjacent to v_1 and v_2.

H is a *gem* if H has five vertices, say $v_1, \ldots, v_5$ such that $v_1, \ldots, v_4$ induce a P_4 and v_5 is adjacent to v_1, v_2, v_3, and v_4.

H is a *double-gem* (see Figure 1) if H has six vertices, say $v_1, \ldots, v_6$ such that $v_1, \ldots, v_5$ induce a gem, say with P_4 (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) and v_6 is only adjacent to v_3 and v_4.

We say that for a vertex set $X \subseteq V$, a vertex $v \notin X$ has a join (resp., co-join) to X if $X \subseteq N(v)$ (resp., $X \subseteq \overline{N}(v)$). Join (resp., co-join) of v to X is denoted by $v①X$ (resp., $v⓪X$); if $v①X$ then v is *universal for* X. Correspondingly, for vertex sets $X, Y \subseteq V$ with $X \cap Y = \emptyset$, $X①Y$ denotes $x①Y$ for all $x \in X$ and $X⓪Y$ denotes $x⓪Y$ for all $x \in X$. A vertex $x \notin U$ *contacts* U if x has a neighbor in U. For vertex sets U, U' with $U \cap U' = \emptyset$, U *contacts* U' if there is a vertex in U contacting U'.

As a first step for our results, we show:

Lemma 1. *If $G = (V, E)$ is a chordal graph, Q is a clique in G and Z is a connected component in $G[V \setminus Q]$ such that every vertex $q \in Q$ has a neighbor in Z then there is a universal vertex $z \in Z$ for Q, i.e., z①Q.*

Proof. We show inductively for $Q = \{q_1, \ldots, q_k\}$ that there is a $z \in Z$ with z①Q:

If $k = 1$ then trivially, there is such a vertex $z \in Z$, and if $k = 2$, say $Q = \{q_1, q_2\}$, then let $x, y \in Z$ be such that $q_1x \in E$ and $q_2y \in E$. If $xq_2 \notin E$ and $yq_1 \notin E$ then take a shortest path P_{xy} between x and y in Z; clearly, since G is chordal, there is a vertex in P_{xy} seeing both q_1 and q_2.

Now assume that the claim is true for clique $Q \setminus \{q_k\}$ with $k - 1$ vertices and let $x \in Z$ be a universal vertex for $Q \setminus \{q_k\}$. If $xq_k \in E$, we are done. Thus assume that $xq_k \notin E$, and let $y \in Z$ with $q_ky \in E$. If $xy \in E$ then, since G is chordal, clearly, y is adjacent to all q_i, $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Thus, assume that the distance between x and y in Z is larger than 1. Without loss of generality, let y be a neighbor of q_k in Z which is closest to x. Let P_{xy} be a shortest path between x and y in Z. Thus, q_k is nonadjacent to every internal vertex in P_{xy} and to x. Then, since G is chordal, y is adjacent to all q_i, $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. Thus, Lemma 1 is shown. □

3 k-Good Cliques in Chordal Graphs

3.1 $2K_2$-free chordal graphs

For making this manuscript self-contained, let us repeat the characterization of split graphs (and a proof variant which can be generalized for k-good cliques).

Theorem 1 ([5]). *A chordal graph G is $2K_2$-free if and only if G is a split graph.*

Proof. If G is a split graph then clearly, G is $2K_2$-free chordal.

For the converse direction, assume to the contrary that for every clique Q of G, there is a connected component, say Z_Q, of $G[V \setminus Q]$ with at least two vertices; we call such components 2-*nontrivial*. Since G is $2K_2$-free, all other components of $G[V \setminus Q]$ consist of isolated vertices.

Let $Q_1 := \{q \in Q : q \text{ has a neighbor in } Z_Q\}$, and $Q_2 := Q \setminus Q_1$, i.e., $Q_2$⓪Z_Q. Thus, $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ is a partition of Q. Since G is $2K_2$-free and Z_Q is 2-nontrivial, clearly, $|Q_2| \leq 1$, and there is no connected component in $G[V \setminus (Q_1 \cup Z_Q)]$ with at least two vertices. Thus, $G[V \setminus (Q_1 \cup Z_Q)]$ is an independent vertex set.

Let Q be a clique in G with smallest 2-nontrivial component Z_Q of $G[V \setminus Q]$ with respect to all cliques in G. Clearly, Z_Q is also the nontrivial component of $G[V \setminus Q_1]$, i.e., $Z_{Q_1} = Z_Q$. Thus, Q_1 is a clique in G with smallest 2-nontrivial component, and from now on, we can assume that every vertex in Q_1 has a neighbor in Z_{Q_1}. Thus, by Lemma 1, there is a universal vertex $z \in Z_{Q_1}$ for Q_1, i.e., z①Q_1.

This implies that for the clique $Q' := Q_1 \cup \{z\}$, the 2-nontrivial component $Z_{Q'}$ (if there is any for Q') is smaller than the one of Q_1 which is a contradiction. Thus, Theorem 1 is shown. □

3.2 $(2P_3, 2K_3, P_3 + K_3)$-free chordal graphs

Clearly, a connected component with three vertices is either a P_3 or K_3, and graph G is $(2P_3, 2K_3, P_3 + K_3)$-free chordal if and only if G is $(2P_3, 2K_3, P_3 + K_3, C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7)$-free. In a very similar way as for Theorem 1, we show:

Theorem 2. *A chordal graph G is $(2P_3, 2K_3, P_3 + K_3)$-free if and only if G is a chordal-2-generalized split graph.*

Proof. If G is a chordal-2-generalized split graph then clearly, G is $(2P_3, 2K_3, P_3 + K_3)$-free chordal.

For the converse direction, assume to the contrary that for every clique Q of G, there is a connected component, say Z_Q, of $G[V \setminus Q]$ with at least three vertices; we call such components 3-*nontrivial*.

Let $Q_1 := \{q \in Q : q \text{ has a neighbor in } Z_Q\}$, and $Q_2 := Q \setminus Q_1$, i.e., $Q_2 ⓪ Z_Q$. Thus, $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ is a partition of Q. Since G is $(2P_3, 2K_3, P_3 + K_3)$-free and Z_Q is 3-nontrivial, clearly, $|Q_2| \leq 2$, and there is no connected component in $G[V \setminus (Q_1 \cup Z_Q)]$ with at least three vertices. Thus, $G[V \setminus (Q_1 \cup Z_Q)]$ is a hereditary induced matching.

Let Q be a clique in G with smallest 3-nontrivial component Z_Q of $G[V \setminus Q]$ with respect to all cliques in G. Clearly, Z_Q is also the nontrivial component of $G[V \setminus Q_1]$, i.e., $Z_{Q_1} = Z_Q$. Thus, Q_1 is a clique in G with smallest 3-nontrivial component, and from now on, we can assume that every vertex in Q_1 has a neighbor in Z_{Q_1}. Thus, by Lemma 1, there is a universal vertex $z \in Z_{Q_1}$ for Q_1, i.e., $z ① Q_1$. This implies that for the clique $Q' := Q_1 \cup \{z\}$, the 3-nontrivial component $Z_{Q'}$ (if there is any for Q') is smaller than the one of Q_1 which is a contradiction. Thus, Theorem 2 is shown. □

Clearly, not every $(2P_3, 2K_3, P_3 + K_3)$-free graph and even not every $(2P_3,\ 2K_3,\ P_3 + K_3,\ C_5, C_6, C_7)$-free graph has a 3-good clique as the following example shows:

Let v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 induce a C_4 with edges $v_i v_{i+1}$ (index arithmetic modulo 4) and let x_1, x_2, x_3 be personal neighbors of v_1, v_2, v_3 correspondingly. Then any clique Q has only at most two vertices, and for none of them, $G[V \setminus Q]$ is a hereditary induced matching.

3.3 The general case of h-good cliques in chordal graphs

As usual, for a pair of connected graphs H_1, H_2 with disjoint vertex sets, let $H_1 + H_2$ denote the disjoint union of H_1 and H_2. For any natural h, let $\mathcal{C}_h$ denote the family of connected graphs with h vertices, and let $\mathcal{A}_h = \{X + Y : X, Y \in \mathcal{C}_h\}$. In a very similar way as for Theorems 1 and 2, we can show:

Theorem 3. *For any natural h, chordal graph G is $\mathcal{A}_{h+1}$-free if and only if there is a clique Q of G such that every connected component of $G[V \setminus Q]$ has at most h vertices.*

Proof. If G is a chordal graph with a clique Q of G such that every connected component of $G[V \setminus Q]$ has at most h vertices, then clearly, G is $\mathcal{A}_{h+1}$-free chordal.

For the converse direction, assume to the contrary that for every clique Q of G, there is a connected component, say Z_Q, of $G[V \setminus Q]$ with at least $h+1$ vertices; we call such components $(h+1)$-*nontrivial*.

Let $Q_1 := \{q \in Q : q \text{ has a neighbor in } Z_Q\}$, and $Q_2 := Q \setminus Q_1$, i.e., $Q_2 ⓪ Z_Q$. Thus, $Q = Q_1 \cup Q_2$ is a partition of Q. Since G is $\mathcal{A}_{h+1}$-free and Z_Q is $(h+1)$-nontrivial, clearly, $|Q_2| \leq h$, and there is no connected component in $G[V \setminus (Q_1 \cup Z_Q)]$ with at least $h+1$ vertices. Thus, every connected component of $G[V \setminus (Q_1 \cup Z_Q)]$ has at most h vertices.

Let Q be a clique in G with smallest $(h+1)$-nontrivial component Z_Q of $G[V \setminus Q]$ with respect to all cliques in G. Clearly, Z_Q is also the nontrivial component of $G[V \setminus Q_1]$, i.e., $Z_{Q_1} = Z_Q$. Thus, Q_1 is a clique in G with smallest $(h+1)$-nontrivial component, and from now on, we can assume that every vertex in Q_1 has a neighbor in Z_{Q_1}. Thus, by Lemma 1, there is a universal vertex $z \in Z_{Q_1}$ for Q_1, i.e., $z ① Q_1$.

This implies that for the clique $Q' := Q_1 \cup \{z\}$, the $(h+1)$-nontrivial component $Z_{Q'}$ (if there is any for Q') is smaller than the one of Q_1 which is a contradiction. Thus, Theorem 3 is shown. □

Concerning the recognition problem, Tyshkevich and Chernyak [9] showed that unipolar graphs can be recognized in $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time. This time bound was slightly improved in [4], and in [7], McDiarmid and Yolov give a $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ time recognition algorithm for unipolar graphs and generalized split graphs. Clearly, for each fixed k, chordal-k-generalized split graphs can be recognized in $\mathcal{O}(nm)$ time since chordal graphs have at most n maximal cliques, and for each of them, say Q, it can be checked in linear time whether the connected components of $G[V \setminus Q]$ have at most k vertices.

4 Characterizing Split-Matching-Extended Graphs

$G = (V, E)$ is a *split-matching-extended graph* if V can be partitioned into a clique Q, an independent vertex set S_Q and the vertex set of an induced matching M_Q in G such that S_QⓄ$V(M_Q)$ and for every edge $xy \in M_Q$, at most one of x, y has neighbors in Q (note that $S_Q \cup V(M_Q)$ is a hereditary induced matching in G). Clearly, split-matching-extended graphs are chordal. Thus, split-matching-extended graphs are a special case of chordal-2-generalized split graphs.

Clearly, split-matching-extended graphs can be recognized in linear time since for every edge $xy \in M$, the degree of x or y is 1, and deleting all such vertices of degree 1 leads to a split graph (which can be recognized in linear time).

Various algorithmic problems such as Hamiltonian Circuit and Minimum Domination are $\mathbb{NP}$-complete for split graphs. Efficient Domination, however, is solvable in polynomial time (even in linear time [1]) for split graphs while it is $\mathbb{NP}$-complete for split-matching-extended graphs (see e.g. [2]).

As mentioned in [2], the graph G_H in the reduction of Exact Cover 3XC to Efficient Domination is ($2P_3$, $K_3 + P_3$, $2K_3$, butterfly, extended butterfly, extended co-P, extended chair, double-gem)-free chordal (and clearly, a special kind of unipolar graphs). Clearly, $2P_3$-free implies C_k-free for each $k \geq 8$.

Theorem 4. *G is a split-matching-extended graph if and only if G is (C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7, $2P_3$, $K_3 + P_3$, $2K_3$, butterfly, extended butterfly, extended co-P, extended chair, double-gem)-free.*

Proof. Clearly, if G is a split-matching-extended graph then G is (C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7, $2P_3$, K_3+P_3, $2K_3$, butterfly, extended butterfly, extended co-P, extended chair, double-gem)-free.

For the other direction, assume that G is ($C_4, C_5, C_6, C_7, 2P_3$, $K_3 + P_3$, $2K_3$, butterfly, extended butterfly, extended co-P, extended chair, double-gem)-free. Then by Theorem 2, G has a 2-good clique Q such that $G[V \setminus Q]$ is a hereditary induced matching, say with independent vertex set $S_Q = \{s_1, \ldots, s_k\}$ and induced matching $M_Q = \{x_1y_1, \ldots, x_\ell y_\ell\}$. Let Q be a maximum 2-good clique of G.

Claim 4.1. *For every edge $xy \in E$ with $x, y \in N(Q)$, $N_Q(x) \subseteq N_Q(y)$ and correspondingly for the non-neighborhoods, $\overline{N_Q}(y) \subseteq \overline{N_Q}(x)$ or vice versa, and in particular, x and y have a common neighbor and a common non-neighbor in Q.*

Proof. The claim obviously holds since G is chordal and Q is maximum. ⋄

Claim 4.2. *For every edge $xy \in E$ with $x, y \in N(Q)$, x and y have exactly one common non-neighbor in Q.*

Proof. Recall that by Claim 4.1, x and y have a common neighbor, say $q_{xy} \in Q$, and suppose to the contrary that x and y have two common non-neighbors, say $q_1, q_2 \in Q$, $q_1 \neq q_2$. Then x, y, q_{xy}, q_1, q_2 induce a butterfly in G which is a contradiction. Thus, Claim 4.2 is shown. ⋄

Claim 4.3. *For every edge $xy \in E$ with $x, y \in N(Q)$, at least one of x and y has at least two non-neighbors in Q. Moreover, if $N_Q(x) \subseteq N_Q(y)$ then y has exactly one non-neighbor in Q, and thus, $N_Q(x) \subset N_Q(y)$.*

Proof. If both x and y would have exactly one non-neighbor, say $q_x, q_y \in Q$ with $xq_x \notin E$ and $yq_y \notin E$ then by Claim 4.1, $q_x = q_y$ and now, $(Q \setminus \{q_x\}) \cup \{x, y\}$ would be a larger clique in G but Q is assumed to be a maximum clique in G. Thus, at least one of x, y has at least two non-neighbors in Q.

By Claim 4.1, we have the corresponding inclusions of neighborhoods and non-neighborhoods in Q. If $N_Q(x) \subseteq N_Q(y)$ and y has two non-neighbors in Q then also x has these non-neighbors but this contradicts Claim 4.2. $\diamond$

Claim 4.4. *$G[N(Q)]$ is $2K_2$-free.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $G[N(Q)]$ contains $2K_2$, say $xy, x'y'$ with $xy \in E$ and $x'y' \in E$. Let $z \in Q$ be a common neighbor of x, y, and let $z' \in Q$ be a common neighbor of x', y'. If $z = z'$ then x, y, x', y', z induce a butterfly. Thus, $z \neq z'$ for any common neighbors z of xy, z' of $x'y'$. If x', y' miss z and x, y miss z' then x, y, x', y', z, z' induce an extended butterfly. If x', y' miss z but exactly one of x, y, say x, sees z' then x, z, x', y', z' induce a butterfly. If exactly one of x, y, say x, sees z' and exactly one of x', y', say x', sees z then x, y, z, z', x', y' induce a double-gem. Thus, in any case we get a contradiction, and Claim 4.4 is shown. $\diamond$

Thus, for at most one of the edges $x_iy_i \in M_Q$, both x_i and y_i have a neighbor in Q; without loss of generality, assume that x_1 and y_1 have a neighbor in Q, and for all other edges $x_jy_j \in M_Q$, $j \geq 2$, y_j⓪Q. By Claim 4.1, let without loss of generality $N_Q(x_1) \subseteq N_Q(y_1)$, and let $u \in Q$ be a common neighbor of x_1 and y_1. By Claim 4.3, y_1 has exactly one non-neighbor, say z, in Q (which also misses x_1). Since G is extended-co-P-free and butterfly-free, and by definition, z⓪$\{y_1, \ldots, y_\ell\}$, we have z⓪$\{x_1, \ldots, x_\ell\}$, and since G is extended-chair-free and butterfly-free, z has at most one neighbor in S_Q.

Let $Q' := (Q \setminus \{z\}) \cup \{y_1\}$; clearly, Q' is a clique in G. Then according to Q', G is a split-matching-extended graph, and thus, Theorem 4 is shown. □

Note added in proof. After writing this manuscript, we learnt that actually, the results of this manuscript are not new; they follow from previous papers of Gagarin [6] and of Zverovich [10]. Sorry for that!

References

[1] A. Brandstädt and R. Mosca, Weighted efficient domination for P_5-free and P_6-free graphs, extended abstract in: Proceedings of WG 2016, P. Heggernes, ed., LNCS 9941, pp. 38-49, 2016. Full version: *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 30, 4 (2016) 2288-2303.

[2] A. Brandstädt and R. Mosca, On efficient domination for some classes of H-free chordal graphs, CoRR arXiv:1701.03414, 2017.

[3] T. Ekim, P. Hell, J. Stacho, and D. de Werra, Polarity of chordal graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 156 (2008) 2469-2479.

[4] E.M. Eschen and X. Wang, Algorithms for unipolar and generalized split graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 162 (2014) 195-201.

[5] S. Főldes and P.L. Hammer, Split graphs, *Congressus Numerantium* 19 (1977) 311-315.

[6] A.V. Gagarin, Chordal (1,b)-polar graphs (in Russian), *Vestsi Nats. Akad. Navuk Belarusi Ser. Fiz.-Mat. Navuk* 4 (1999) 115-118.

[7] C. McDiarmid and N. Yolov, Recognition of unipolar and generalised split graphs, CoRR arXiv:1604.00922 (2016).

[8] H.J. Prömel and A. Steger, Almost all Berge graphs are perfect, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 1 (1992) 53-79.

[9] R.I. Tyshkevich and A.A. Chernyak, Algorithms for the canonical decomposition of a graph and recognizing polarity, *Izvestia Akademii Nauk BSSR, ser. Fiz. Mat. Nauk* 6 (1985) 16-23 (in Russian).

[10] I.E. Zverovich, Satgraphs and independent domination. Part 1, *Theoretical Computer Science* 352 (2006) 47-56.